

**CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT**

ENDC/PV.291
7 March 1967

ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 7 March 1967, at 10.30 a.m.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAY 23 1967

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

Chairman:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV

(Bulgaria)

GE.67-4010
67-07394

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:
Mr. A. F. AZEREDO da SILVERIA
Mr. D. SILVERIA da MOTA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:
Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV
Mr. T. DAMLANOV
Mr. D. KOSTOV

Burma:
U KYAW MIN

Canada:
Mr. E. L. M. BURNS
Mr. S. F. RAE
Mr. C. J. WEBSTER
Mr. J. R. MORDEN

Czechoslovakia:
Mr. P. WINKLER
Mr. T. LAHODA
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:
Dejazmatch A. ABERRA
Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:
Mr. V. C. TRIVEDI
Mr. K. P. JAIN

Italy:
Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. G. P. TOZZOLI
Mr. E. FRANCO
Mr. F. SORO

Mexico:
Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mr. M. TELLO MACIAS

Nigeria:

Mr. B. O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN

Mr. J. GOLDBLAT

Mr. E. STANIEWSKI

Romania:

Mr. N. ECOBESCO

Mr. O. IONESCO

Mr. C. UNGUREANU

Mr. A. COROIANU

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM

Mr. U. ERICSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A. A. ROSHCHIN

Mr. O. A. GRINEVSKY

Mr. I. I. CHEPROV

Mr. V. B. TOULINOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF

Mr. A. OSMAN

Mr. A. A. SALAM

Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Lord CHALFONT

Mr. B. J. GARNETT

Mr. R. I. T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. W. C. FOSTER

Mr. S. DE PALMA

Mr. G. BUNN

Mr. C. G. BREAM

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

1. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare open the two hundred and ninety-first plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Before I call on the first speaker on my list I should like to address a few words of condolence to the delegation of Canada. I am sure that I am interpreting the feelings of all the members of this Committee in expressing my profound regret at the death of His Excellency, Dr. Georges Vanier, the Governor-General of Canada. On behalf of the Committee I should like to ask Mr. Burns to convey our most sincere condolences to the Government and people of Canada, and to Mrs. Vanier and her family.
3. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Georg Stibi, has delivered to me, as the representative of the Soviet Union and Co-Chairman of the Committee, a Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic addressed to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC/189). This Statement sets out the position of the German Democratic Republic with regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and contains important proposals aimed at ensuring disarmament and at strengthening peace and security in Europe and throughout the world. The questions raised in the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic have the most direct bearing on the negotiations which we are conducting here.
4. May I acquaint you with the text of the letter which we have sent in this connexion to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Protitch, together with the text of the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic? Permit me to read out first the text of our letter to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Protitch:
"The Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Georg Stibi, has delivered to me, as the representative of the USSR in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and Co-Chairman of this Committee, the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and has requested that this Statement be brought to the notice of all States Members of the Committee. The aforesaid Statement sets out the position of the German Democratic Republic with regard to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and some other questions of disarmament.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"I request you to arrange for my letter to be circulated by the Secretariat of the Committee together with the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic attached thereto as an official document of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament."

5. May I now acquaint members of the Committee with the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which is attached to the letter of the Soviet Delegation addressed to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Protitch?

6. I quote:^{1/}

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of all states that the proliferation of nuclear weapons threatens the security of all states and obstructs international disarmament. Accordingly, it has opposed for many years the spread of nuclear weapons and has supported the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; it has repeatedly addressed proposals to this end to the West German Federal Republic as well as to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, the UN General Assembly and other bodies of the United Nations.

"The German Democratic Republic endorses the unanimous appeal of the XXIst Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization that all necessary steps should be taken to facilitate and bring about the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and that any contrary actions shall be refrained from.

"In line with the appeal of the XXIst Session of the UN General Assembly the German Democratic Republic has taken further initiatives in the interests of strengthening peace. Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, in his 1967 New Year message, made comprehensive proposals for disarmament, for guaranteeing security in Europe and normalising the relations between the two German states. The following proposals were made, inter alia:

^{1/} Translation provided by the delegation of the USSR.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

- " - The Governments of the two German states conclude a treaty on the renunciation of the use of force in their mutual relations.
- The Governments of the two German states recognise, in agreed identical statements, the present frontiers in Europe.
- The Governments of the two German states agree contractually upon a reduction of their armaments expenditures each by one half.
- The Governments of the two German states declare their renunciation of the possession, control or share in the control over atomic weapons in any form. At the same time they agree and pledge in a binding form in identical and simultaneous statements their readiness to participate in an atom-free zone in Europe.
- The Governments of the two German states conclude a treaty by which they pledge themselves to adopt jointly and simultaneously for both German states the status of neutrality guaranteed by the powers.

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic resolutely supports the conclusion of a treaty barring the spread of nuclear weapons in any form. Such a treaty must guarantee that the West German Federal Republic is completely barred from access to nuclear weapons, both directly and indirectly. In view of the fact that the West German Federal Republic is the only state in Europe which threatens aggression against other states, which makes territorial claims against them, and which seeks to change the status quo, the prevention of an atomic armament of West Germany is of decisive importance for peace in Europe and in the world.

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic points to the fact that the Government of the West German Federal Republic has recently enormously increased its efforts to obtain control over nuclear weapons in one form or another. The West German Government spares no effort, in the form of systematic diplomatic actions and ever new demands and declarations, to prevent the conclusion of a treaty on an effective non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, with the aim of leaving open for itself various possibilities of access to nuclear weapons. The Government of the West German Federal Republic thus shows itself to be the chief trouble-maker and the principal stumbling block on the road to the conclusion of such a treaty.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"The official spokesmen of the Government of the West German Federal Republic pose a number of 'conditions for the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, conditions which run counter to the intention of the treaty and would rob it of meaning. The Government of the German Democratic Republic holds that the West German Federal Republic must renounce access to nuclear weapons in all forms and accede to the treaty unconditionally.

"The Government of the West German Federal Republic opposes the conclusion of a treaty by demanding, for instance, that the possibility of a 'formation of a collective nuclear striking force by a community of nations,' a so-called 'European joint solution,' should be left open. In this way West German military circles intend to use alternative routes to obtain access to, and to share in the possession and in the control of nuclear weapons, in order to be able to carry out their aggressive programme of territorial conquest. The interests of peace demand that this claim should be strictly rejected.

"The West German Federal Government also objects to the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the grounds that West Germany's 'security' would be threatened if it had no control over nuclear weapons. In reality nobody threatens West Germany's security; it is rather European security which is threatened by the revanchist claims of the ruling circles of the West German Federal Republic. Nuclear arms for West Germany would most gravely endanger security in Europe. Security for the peoples of Europe requires that both German states -- the West German Federal Republic too -- renounce nuclear weapons in any form.

"The Government of the West German Federal Republic also opposes the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons on the grounds that a renunciation of the production of military fissionable material would lead to 'a restriction in the peaceful use of nuclear energy' and to 'technical-scientific backwardness.' This is tantamount to the claim that the development of economy, science and technology could be ensured only through the atomic arms race. The Government of the German Democratic Republic knows itself to be

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

in agreement with the vast majority of all states when it resolutely rejects such a false claim which is hostile to peace. Besides, the West German Federal Republic has today at its disposal 35 reactors, either in operation or under construction, and thus has every opportunity to utilize nuclear energy for peaceful, scientific-technical progress and to co-operate fully in international developments in this field.

"Ambassador Grewe, West Germany's official representative in the NATO Council, revealed the real idea underlying the objections of his government to a treaty on the non-proliferation of atomic weapons when he stated that West Germany could not become a 'great power' without 'nuclear weapons of its own.' It is rather the aggressive imperialist claim to be a big power, and not concern for scientific progress which lies at the root of all the 'conditions' and 'objections' put forward by the West German Government against the conclusion of an atomic non-proliferation treaty.

"The Government of the West German Federal Republic, through its Ambassador Grewe, officially lays claim to a 'production of nuclear weapons of its own'. It has made preparations for this for years. Today the efforts to create the material-technical basis for its own nuclear weapons and rockets industry are already well advanced in the Federal Republic. Extensive work of military character is being done in the fields of nuclear, rocket and cosmic technology. Expenditure in these fields rose suddenly to many times its previous level in the past few years.

"In West Germany there exists the greatest stockpile of nuclear warheads stored abroad by the USA; this threatens all other European countries. The Government of the West German Federal Republic does not only insist that these nuclear weapons should remain in West Germany; West German Defence Minister Schroeder, on February 12th 1967, demanded once again the stationing of more nuclear weapons under the command of the Bundeswehr on the frontiers facing the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The West German Government categorically refuses its participation in a nuclear-free

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

zone in Europe. Thus the West German Federal Republic is not free of nuclear weapons and fulfils none of the conditions for putting itself on a par with non-nuclear states.

"In view of the intensified efforts of the Government of the West German Federal Republic to get control of nuclear weapons, the creation of the Permanent Nuclear Committee of NATO in December 1966 and the inclusion of West Germany in the so-called "Nuclear Planning Group" means a new dangerous concession to the aggressive expansive course of this government. Members of the Federal Government have already declared publicly that they will make use of this body to obtain West German participation in the working-out of guiding principles, plans, programmes and procedures for the use of nuclear weapons by the NATO states including the strategic nuclear weapons of the USA not under the control of NATO. These additional and new possibilities only further encourage the militarist and revanchist forces of West Germany in their striving for nuclear weapons. This is all the more dangerous for European and world peace since the West German Federal Republic is now, according to the declaration of the new Chancellor, passing on to a policy of expansion.

"The character of the policy of the West German Government which is dangerous to peace expressed itself above all in an intensified clinging to the claim to sole representation, a claim incompatible with international law and the fundamental principles of the UN Charter. It denies the realities which came into existence on the European continent as a result of the Second World War, and refuses to establish peaceful, normal relations with the sovereign German peace-loving State, the German Democratic Republic. All the demands and 'conditions' made by West Germany aiming at access to nuclear weapons stand in crass contradiction to the requirements of European security. They contradict fundamentally the Potsdam Agreement, the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, and the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, and even agreements including obligations of the Government of the West German Federal Republic towards its allies.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic therefore demands that the Government of the West German Federal Republic should refrain from its policy of putting obstacles on the way to the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and that it should comply with the appeal of Resolution 2149 (XXI) of the United Nations General Assembly; this was done on November 10th 1966 by the Government of the German Democratic Republic in a telegram from Otto Winzer, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the President of the XX1st Session of the United Nations General Assembly.

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic confirms its disarmament proposals

- that the Governments of the two German states should renounce the possession, control or share in the control of nuclear weapons in any form,
- that the Government of the West German Federal Republic should join the readiness repeatedly declared by the Government of the German Democratic Republic to accede without any conditions and reservations to a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons,
- that the nuclear powers, insofar as they have stationed nuclear weapons on German soil, should remove these weapons from German territory, so that both German states should be free of nuclear weapons and remain free of nuclear weapons,
- that the Government of the West German Federal Republic, in the interest of securing European security, should declare its readiness to participate in a nuclear-free zone in Europe.

"In making these proposals the Government of the German Democratic Republic knows that it is completely in agreement with the standpoint of the peoples and governments which are striving for effective measures for the consolidation of peace and security in Europe and in the world.

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic requests the Member States of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee to support the proposals submitted by it and to consider them as an expression of the firm determination

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to facilitate and expedite the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Government of the German Democratic Republic is at any time ready to submit this point of view directly to the Session of the Committee through its authorized representatives."

7. I have finished reading out the letter of our delegation in connexion with the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic. This Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic which I have just read out is an important contribution to the work of the Committee. It is intended to contribute to the conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and to the solution of other urgent problems of disarmament, upon which the security of the peoples of Europe and of the whole world depends. The Government of the German Democratic Republic, having taken an important and constructive initiative, has once again demonstrated its deep devotion to the cause of peace and disarmament and its concern to avert the threat of a nuclear war.

8. We also draw the attention of members of the Committee to the warnings contained in the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic concerning the situation in the Federal Republic of Germany, where there is a resurgence of neo-Nazi and militaristic forces that would like to increase international tension and render more difficult the solution of disarmament problems.

9. The Soviet delegation considers that the Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic should be considered and studied with the greatest attention by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

10. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): I should like to raise a point of order in connexion with the desire of the representative of the Soviet Union to introduce a statement from the so-called German Democratic Republic as a Conference document. It is well known to the Committee, this matter having been discussed here many times before, that the position of the United States remains the same today as it was on preceding occasions: that is to say that, as far as my delegation is concerned, this communication should be treated in accordance with the procedures governing communications from non-governmental representatives or organizations. Alternatively, of course, it may be circulated as an attachment to a letter from a member of this Committee; and it will then be that letter which is circulated as a document.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

11. I must again take exception, as I did at the last plenary meeting, to propaganda charges about the intentions of a country not represented on this Committee. However, I do not intend, by comment from me, to dignify the unsupported charges just quoted by the representative of the Soviet Union. I repeat again that the Federal Republic of Germany has made an international undertaking not to manufacture nuclear weapons. It supports the principle of a non-proliferation treaty. Those who have not themselves undertaken any formal obligation to renounce the production of nuclear weapons are hardly in a position to criticize those who have. Repeated and co-ordinated attacks on a country which is examining the consequences of adherence to a non-proliferation treaty through public debate can only hinder the objective which we all seek here. Public debate about a non-proliferation treaty is not only healthy but essential if we want it to have the solid backing which this kind of treaty should have.

12. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I should like to make a few comments in connexion with the statement of the representative of the United States.

13. First, on the subject of procedure. In the present case the argument put forward by the representative of the United States to the effect that delegations are not entitled to make statements and to submit and read out the views of other governments is not at all in accordance with the procedure that has been established in this regard. Each delegation is, so to say, the master of its own words. If it sees fit to make a statement setting forth the position of another government, it is fully entitled to do so. Likewise it is fully entitled to introduce into the Committee an appropriate document setting forth any question which it deems necessary to raise.

14. Therefore all the arguments adduced here by the representative of the United States have no legal basis. The right of each delegation to make any statement, the right of each delegation to introduce any document, is its absolutely indisputable right. In that case no one can restrict any delegation in regard to what document it wishes to submit or what statement it intends to make here. That is a small comment on the subject of procedure.

15. Now one comment on the substance. The representative of the United States has said that the Federal Republic of Germany is the only State in the world which has voluntarily undertaken in an international agreement not to produce nuclear weapons. Allow me to say that our delegation does not in the least agree with such an

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

interpretation of the situation as regards the so-called agreement of the Federal Republic of Germany not to produce nuclear weapons on its territory. That renunciation is a consequence of the defeat of the Third Reich in the Second World War. It is a consequence of the agreements at Potsdam whereby, as a result of the defeat of Fascist Germany, three Powers, subsequently joined by France, assumed an obligation to maintain Germany in a state of demilitarization and not to allow it again to threaten peace in Europe and throughout the world.

16. Therefore to say that the undertaking was assumed by the Federal Republic of Germany voluntarily is not an accurate interpretation of the situation. Underlying the situation are the defeat of Fascist Germany and the Potsdam Agreements, which provided that Germany should remain in a state of demilitarization so that it should never be able to threaten the peace in Europe and throughout the world. That, and not at all that it has voluntarily assumed such an obligation, is what underlies the situation which determines that the Federal Republic of Germany is not entitled to possess nuclear weapons.

17. We wished to make this very important point quite clear, especially since representatives of the United States often advance this incorrect argument.

18. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

19. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): I hesitate to intervene again on a right of reply, but apparently the representative of the Soviet Union did not listen to what I said and I will repeat the part of it that bears on his recent statement:

"It is well known to the Committee, this matter having been discussed here many times before, that the position of the United States remains the same to-day as it was on preceding occasions -- that is to say, that, as far as my delegation is concerned, this communication should be treated in accordance with the procedures governing communications from non-governmental representatives or organizations. Alternatively, of course, it may be circulated as an attachment to a letter from a member of this Committee and it will then be that letter which is circulated as a document." (supra, para.10)

(Mr. Foster, United States)

If the representative of the Soviet Union wished to introduce this communication as an attachment to a letter from his delegation, then there would be no objection from my delegation; but in that case it would be the letter of the Soviet delegation with its attachment which was circulated as a document.

20. If I may continue, I should like, as I have indicated, to touch on another point which is of concern to the Committee. I do this in the light of the discussion on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (ENDC/186) and its relationship to a non-proliferation treaty. My delegation would like to make its views known on one point in connexion with that Treaty.

21. The United States considers the conclusion of the first international instrument establishing a nuclear-free zone to be of unique significance. It is an excellent example of an arms control measure brought about through a regional initiative. The countries responsible deserve great praise for their initiative and their persistence in seeing it through to a successful conclusion.

22. We have not yet had time to give thorough study to the Final Act, including the Treaty text, and cannot therefore comment on every aspect of the Treaty. I do, however, want to state the view of my Government on one of the important elements of the Treaty, because it has considerable significance for the negotiation of the non-proliferation treaty with which we are concerned. That is the manner in which the nuclear-free zone Treaty deals with the problem of peaceful nuclear explosives. We interpret it as prohibiting contracting parties from acquiring or testing nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes.

23. Let me explain how we draw this interpretation from the Treaty. Article 1 prohibits contracting parties from the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition of any "nuclear weapons" by any means whatsoever. If the phrase "nuclear weapon", for the purposes of this Treaty, includes a nuclear explosive device intended for peaceful purposes, the contracting parties would clearly be prohibited from acquiring or testing such a device. Whether the device is "peaceful" or not could be said to be only a matter of intent; since in so far as technology is concerned there is no difference between a nuclear explosive device which would have only peaceful applications and one which could also be employed as a weapon.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

24. Members will recall the statement made by the United States representative to this Committee on this point on 9 August 1966. He said that a nuclear explosive device intended for peaceful purposes could be used as a nuclear weapon, or easily adapted to such use -- no matter what the intention of its maker was (ENDC/PV.280, p.13). There has been general acceptance of this technological fact by the delegations of Canada, Sweden and the United Kingdom. We understand the important statement made at our meeting on 21 February 1967 by the representative of Mexico to be in accord also (ENDC/PV.287). The Soviet Union indicated its agreement in a statement to the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America on 12 February 1967. I believe Lord Chalfont expressed the point most graphically when he said: "A device which moves a million tons of earth to dig a canal or create an oil deposit can just as easily pulverize a city of a million people". (ENDC/PV.288, para.16)

25. In recognition of this fact, Article 5 of the Latin-American nuclear-free zone Treaty defines a nuclear weapon as -

"... any device which is capable of releasing nuclear energy in an uncontrolled manner and which has a group of characteristics that are appropriate for use for warlike purposes." (ENDC/186, p.16)

The plain language of that definition includes any nuclear device which can be used as a weapon. As I have indicated, there seems to be general agreement on the part of those who have expressed themselves on the subject that devices intended for peaceful purposes can also be used as weapons. To my knowledge, no one contends that they cannot. The definition seems therefore clearly to encompass such devices.

26. The negotiating history of the definition at Mexico City reinforces this view. A prior draft of the definition had included a requirement that, to constitute a nuclear weapon, the explosive must be intended for use for purposes of war. If it was not so intended, it would not have been a nuclear weapon under this definition. The words concerning intention were, however, omitted in the final language. This history was confirmed by Ambassador Garcia Robles, Chairman of the Preparatory Commission and, more than any other one man, the draftsman of this Treaty. I call attention again to his statement at our meeting of 21 February in which he repeated his interpretation of the Treaty on this point (ENDC/PV.287, paras. 64 et seq.). This history makes clear that intention is not the test of whether a nuclear explosive is a weapon or not.

(Mr. Foster, United States)

27. Our view is also reinforced by the overall purpose of the Treaty: to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to Latin America, with all the tensions and dangers which would follow in their path. In view of the technical facts which I have set forth, it seems clear that a country which acquired or tested a nuclear explosive device would find it exceedingly difficult to reassure its neighbours or rivals by a statement that the device was only intended for peaceful purposes. Clearly the treaty must prohibit the acquisition or testing of any nuclear explosive device by contracting parties, or it will contain a large loophole. In our view, Articles 1 and 5 of the Treaty contain such a prohibition.

28. Article 18 of the Treaty, which deals specifically with nuclear devices for peaceful purposes, does not detract from the force of Articles 1 and 5. Indeed, it makes clear that such explosions may be carried out only "in accordance with the provisions of this article and the other articles of the Treaty, particularly articles 1 and 5." (ENDC/186, p.24). Thus, unless someone can some day invent a nuclear explosive which cannot be used as a nuclear weapon --- and as an engineer I do not see how that could ever be possible -- the treaty will prohibit contracting parties from carrying out such explosions.

29. That is not, however, to say that we believe that contracting parties should be denied the benefits of such explosions. Indeed, the contrary is true. As the United States representative made clear to this Committee in August of last year (ENDC/PV.280), the United States believes that explosive services of this kind should be made available to non-nuclear-weapon States under appropriate international procedures if and when peaceful nuclear explosives that are permissible under test-ban Treaty limitations (ENDC/100/Rev.1) become economically and technologically feasible. This would, of course, have to be on a non-discriminatory basis.

30. In conclusion, I refer again to our statement of last summer on nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, and I quote its basic conclusion:

"It seems to us ... that the development of nuclear explosives for peaceful applications by a State not already possessing nuclear weapons could hardly be accepted by the world as involving peaceful purposes only. Such a development would not be consistent with the purposes of a Treaty designed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Therefore the restrictions of any non-proliferation treaty which is negotiated should be applicable equally to nuclear weapons and to nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes." (ENDC/PV.280, p.14)

31. Mr. AZEREDO DA SILVEIRA (Brazil): I should like to reserve the position of my delegation regarding the interpretation we have just heard from the representative of the United States concerning the Treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America. If necessary, I should take up this point later.

32. Mr. BURNS (Canada): I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and through you the members of the Committee, for your kind expression of sympathy in connexion with the death of our Governor-General, Georges Vanier.

33. I should like to read to you a few words from the statement which was made by our Prime Minister in Parliament when tributes were paid to the late Georges Vanier.

Mr. Pearson said:

"In its one hundred years Canada has had no more devoted and courageous a servant than General Georges Philias Vanier. His whole life is the shining record of that service. He never failed any test of duty in peace or in war. He was a good and faithful servant. General Vanier was a descendent of one of Canada's first settlers. His pride in his French-Canadian ancestry was exceeded only by his love of Canada today and his passionate belief in its unity and in its destiny. He was in very truth a man for all Canada. He was a great patriot and a fine Christian gentleman, a man who embodied in his own person and in his own life all that is best in Canadians and all that we hope for our country."

34. Mr. Chairman, as you request, I shall certainly convey to the Government of Canada and to the family of the late General Vanier the very kind expression of condolences which you addressed to us. I would say in conclusion that a book of condolence has been opened at the Permanent Mission of Canada, 16 Parc du Château Banquet, from today, and will remain open until 9 March.

35. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): As no other representative wishes to take the floor, I shall read out the proposed text of the communiqué for this meeting:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 291st plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Kroum Christov, representative of Bulgaria.

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Brazil and Canada.

"The following document was submitted: 'Letter dated 7 March 1967 from the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Roshchin, addressed to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Dr. Protitch, concerning a statement of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Germany addressed to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.'

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 9 March 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

Is there any objection?

36. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): There is an objection. There is certainly no objection to referring to a letter from the Soviet Union, but there is an objection to including a reference to a document from the so-called German Democratic Republic. We have never included such a reference, and the United States will not agree to its inclusion now.

37. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We consider that it is the right of every delegation to name a document as it deems necessary and in such a way that the content of the document which has been submitted would be indicated. Therefore it seems to me that the arguments put forward by the representative of the United States cannot be taken into consideration in solving this problem.

38. We put the question as follows: we have submitted a document, a letter, and we have given a name to the document, because if we had not given a name to this document it would have been quite unjustified. Also unjustified would be a proposal to exclude from the communiqué the name of the document which has been submitted. In the present case the fact is that we have submitted a letter of the representative of the Soviet Union in connexion with a Statement of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

39. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America): This has occurred for the last several years, and no communiqué of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has ever referred to a document of the Soviet Union circulating a document from the so-called German Democratic Republic. I have before me last year's communiqué when

(Mr. Foster, United States)

the same attempt was made (ENDC/PV.238), and I understand that in 1965 exactly the same procedure was followed (ENDC/PV.222). As far as the United States is concerned, again I say that we will object to this communiqué; and the procedure of this Committee is that the communiqué must have the unanimous support of its members. And that is a reasonable situation if we are not to be flooded with documents from all kinds of organizations which would take the opportunity to introduce, by a title, certain points which they wished to make. That would be inconsistent with the procedures we have followed throughout these years, procedures which have been agreed upon between the co-Chairman in the past and have been followed so far. I believe they should continue to be followed.

40. The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Since no other objection has been raised and no other representative wishes to take the floor, I think I may sum up the situation.

41. On the one hand there is the fact that a document -- the letter from the Soviet delegation -- has been submitted to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In keeping with the right of the Soviet delegation and of any other delegation, and in keeping with the established procedure in this Committee, that document must be mentioned in the text of the communiqué as presented.

42. On the other hand, there are the objections raised by the representative of the United States, and he is right in stressing that the communiqué of a meeting must be adopted unanimously.

43. The Chair, I must confess, has some difficulty in settling this procedural problem. May I, in fulfilment of my duty to help the Committee to find a solution, suggest that the text of the communiqué read as follows:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 291st plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Kroum Christov, representative of Bulgaria.

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

"Statements were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Brazil and Canada.

"The following document was submitted:

"Letter^{1/} dated 7 March 1967 from the representative of the Soviet Union Mr. A. A. Roshchin, addressed to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. D. Frotitch.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 9 March 1967, at 10.30 a.m."

There being no objection, the communiqué is approved in that form.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

^{1/} Circulated as document ENDC/189.